



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

imposing a criminal liability thereon, if such were possible. However, such construction, it is submitted, does violence to the English language. The statute states expressly that it is applicable to foreign vessels in American ports. The violation is not the making of a contract in a foreign country, but in deducting such advances in an American port and in refusing to pay one-half of the wages then earned. Though the result reached in the principal case is a desirable one from an international point of view, the real remedy would seem to be with the legislature and not the judiciary.

**SHIPPING — FREIGHT — WHEN RIGHT TO FREIGHT BEGINS.** — The claimant, a shipowner, contracted to carry a cargo of paper for the libellant from New York to Bordeaux. The bill of lading provided that restraints of princes and rulers were to be excepted and "freight for the said goods to be prepaid in full without discount retained and irrevocably, ship and / or cargo lost or not lost." Before the ship was ready to sail, an embargo was placed upon all vessels whose voyages would bring them within the submarine zone, and clearance was consequently refused to the claimant's ship. The cargo was subsequently discharged and the shipowners refused to return the prepaid freight. *Held*, that the shipowner may retain freight though the ship had not broken ground. *The Gracie D. Chambers*, 253 Fed. 182 (Circ. Ct. App.).

At common law, no freight is due until the cargo has been delivered at the port of destination. *Osgood v. Growing*, 2 Camp. 466; *Post v. Robertson*, 1 Johns. (N. Y.) 24. As the carrier's contract is entire, it follows, then, that he could not recover for services rendered prior to the ship's breaking ground. *Curling v. Long*, 1 B. & P. 634; *The Tornado*, 108 U. S. 342. By the law maritime the result would be the same, since the right to freight begins only upon inception of the voyage. *Curling v. Long*, *supra*. See MACLACHLAN, MERCHANT SHIPPING, 5 ed., 546. In England, however, if the contract provides that freight be prepaid, it is not recoverable whether earned or not. *De Silvale v. Kendall*, 4 M. & S. 37; *Allison v. Bristol Marine Ins. Co.* (1876), 1 A. C. 209. In such a case, therefore, where the cargo is destroyed before the ship breaks ground, but after the time fixed for prepayment of freight, the owner may retain the sums advanced. *Coker v. Limerick S. S. Co.*, 34 L. T. R. 18. In the United States the common law applies alike to prepaid freight, and it must be returned when there has been no full performance. *Watson v. Duykinck*, 3 Johns. (N. Y.) 335; *Benner v. Equitable Ins. Co.*, 6 Allen (Mass.) 222. See 1 PARSONS, SHIPPING AND ADMIRALTY, 210. But a specific contract similar to the one in the principal case clearly suspends the common-law rule and produces the same effect as a provision for prepaid freight under the English law. On the basis of the English decision and as a matter of pure construction, therefore, the principal case seems correctly decided. The dissenting opinion prompted by a desire to avoid a harsh result cannot, however, be supported in view of the clear terms of the contract.

**STATUTE OF FRAUDS — INTEREST IN LANDS — VALIDITY OF AN ORAL AGREEMENT TO PAY FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO LAND.** — By an oral agreement defendant leased his premises to plaintiff, and promised to allow plaintiff to remove all improvements or to compensate him for their value. After plaintiff had made certain improvements, including the planting of an orchard, defendant terminated the lease and took possession. The plaintiff brings this action on the oral agreement for the value of the improvements. *Held*, that plaintiff could recover on equitable principles as well as on the oral agreement. *Fredell v. Ormand Mining Co.*, 97 S. E. 386 (N. C.).

By the better view, an oral agreement for the sale of standing trees is invalidated by the Statute of Frauds. *Green v. Armstrong*, 1 Denio (N. Y.) 550; *Hirth v. Graham*, 50 Ohio St. 57. *Contra*, *Marshall v. Green*, 1 C. P. D. 35.